



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[dx.doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2016-310497](https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2016-310497)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Shetty, S. K., Adesh Sundaresan, Hunt, K. A., Desai, P., & Greenough, A. (2016). Changes in the use of humidified high flow nasal cannula oxygen. *ADC Fetal & Neonatal*, 101. <https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2016-310497>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Changes in the use of humidified high flow nasal cannula oxygen

Sandeep Shetty^{1,2}, Adesh Sundaresan¹, Katie Hunt², Prakash Desai⁴, Anne Greenough^{1,2,3}

¹Division of Asthma, Allergy and Lung Biology, MRC and Asthma UK Centre in Allergic Mechanisms of Asthma, King's College London, UK

²Neonatal Intensive Care Centre, King's College Hospital, London, UK

³NIHR Biomedical Centre at Guy's and St Thomas NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London, UK

⁴ Neonatal Intensive Care unit, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital

Address for correspondence: Professor Anne Greenough, NICU, 4th Floor Golden Jubilee Wing, King's College Hospital, Denmark Hill, London, SE5 9RS, UK Tel: 0203 3299 3037; Fax 0203 3299 8284;
Email: anne.greenough@kcl.ac.uk

Key words: Humidified, high flow nasal cannula; continuous positive airway pressure; United Kingdom

Word count: 387

HHFNC has gained popularity in neonatal care. A systematic review [1] of the results of nine trials which included a total of 1,112 infants, however, demonstrated that HHFNC was not superior to other modes of non-invasive ventilation in infants of greater than twenty eight weeks gestational age. We, therefore, sought to determine whether clinical practice regarding HHFNC had changed since 2012 when all UK units were surveyed [2] and also to identify why practitioners preferred HHFNC or CPAP.

In 2015, lead clinicians of all 194 UK neonatal units were identified from the National Neonatal Audit Programme, BAPM directory and a departmental database from previous audits. In 2012, practitioners from the then 203 UK neonatal units had been contacted.[2] Both surveys included questions on the level of neonatal care, the indications for use of HHFNC and the flow rates used. The 2015 survey also contained questions regarding nasal prong size, weaning policies and HHFNC or CPAP preference (practitioners were given a list of possible reasons to choose from).

There was a 100% percent response rate to both surveys. Use of HHFNC was significantly increased in 2015 compared to 2012 ($p<0.001$) (Table 1). Almost all local neonatal and neonatal intensive care units were using HHFNC in 2015. Fewer units were using HHFNC as an alternative to CPAP or weaning from CPAP ($p=0.001$), but a greater proportion were using it as the primary support mode post extubation ($p=0.001$). The 2015 survey highlighted that in 25% of units prong size was chosen to fit snugly and occlude the nostril, whereas it is recommended that the fit should be less than 50% of the nares.[3] Thirty-six percent of units were using HHFNC without guidelines. The highest and lowest flow rates used varied in both surveys, but the magnitude of change of flow when weaning from HHFNC did not differ significantly in the two surveys. In the 2015 survey, weaning the flow in increments of between 0.5-1 L/min and 24 hourly was most popular, but there was no consensus.

This likely reflects that there is currently no evidence to determine the best weaning strategy from HHFNC.[4]

The majority of practitioners preferred HHFNC (Table 2). In particular, almost all thought babies achieved full oral feeds by breast or bottle quicker on HHFNC and that it was more comfortable for the baby than CPAP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding: The research was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre based at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

Competing interests: None

Contributor statement: AG and SS designed the study. SS, AS and KH collected the data for 2015 survey. SS and PD collected data for the 2012 survey. All authors were involved in production of the final manuscript.

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its Licensees to permit this article to be published in Archives of Disease in Childhood editions and any other BMJ PGL products to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence "<http://adc.bmjjournals.com/ifora/licence.dtl>".

REFERENCES

1. Kotecha SJ, Adappa R, Gupta N, et al. Safety and Efficacy of High-Flow Nasal Cannula Therapy in Preterm Infants: A Meta-analysis. *Pediatrics* 2015;**136**:542-53.
2. Desai P, Shetty S, Singh N, et al. Current practice regarding the use of Humidified high flow nasal cannulae (HHFNC) in UK neonatal units. *Arch Dis Child* 2012;**97**:A116.
3. Hochwald O, Osiovich H. High flow nasal cannulae in neonatal intensive care units: is current practice consistent with evidence? *Pediatr Acad Soc* 2010;**62**:187–91.
4. Farley RC, Hough JL, Jardine LA. Strategies for the discontinuation of humidified high flow nasal cannula (HHFNC) in preterm infants. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;**6**:CD011079.

Table1: HHFNC practice in 2012 and 2015

Data are displayed as the n (%)

	2012	2015	P value
HHFNC			
Total number of units	203	194	
Using HHFNC	113 (56%)	169 (87%)	<0.001
Unit Level			
Special Care Unit	12/53 (23%)	22/42 (52%)	0.003
Local Neonatal Unit	60/92 (64%)	84/88 (95%)	<0.001
Neonatal Intensive Care Unit	41/58 (70%)	63/64 (98%)	<0.001
Data are subsequently displayed only for units using HHFNC			
Indication of Use			
Alternative to CPAP/ Weaning from CPAP	66 (58%)	65 (38%)	0.001
Primary mode of respiratory support post extubation	47 (42%)	104 (62%)	0.001
Highest Flow Rate			
8	36 (32%)	78 (46%)	0.011
7	12 (11%)	6 (4%)	0.017
6	38 (34%)	77 (46%)	0.030
5	27 (23%)	8 (4%)	<0.001
Lowest Flow Rate			
4	11 (10%)	18 (11%)	0.485
3	40 (35%)	40 (24%)	0.023
2	45 (40%)	97 (57%)	0.003
1	17 (15%)	14 (8%)	0.058
Size of change in flow when weaning			
0.5 L/min	30 (27%)	51 (30%)	0.301
1 L/min	38 (34%)	58 (35%)	0.504
0.5 - 1 L/min	45 (40%)	60 (36%)	0.271
Time between changes in flow rates			
24 hourly		79 (47%)	
24-48 hourly		21 (12%)	
48 hourly		17 (10%)	
Depends on the infant's condition		52 (31%)	
Prong size			
Snug fit to occlude the nostril		42 (25%)	
Prong size selected to allow air leak		127 (75%)	
Guideline/Policy			
Yes		108 (64%)	

Table 2: Preference for CPAP or HHFNC**Data are displayed as n (%)***

	CPAP	HHFNC	P value
Which is better	18 (11%)	109 (64%)	<0.001
Better access to the infant	1 (1%)	145 (86%)	<0.001
Easier to set up	13 (8%)	138 (82%)	<0.001
Better access for skin to skin care	0 (0%)	162 (96%)	<0.001
Quicker to achieve full bottle feeding	0 (0%)	166 (98%)	<0.001
Quicker to achieve full breast feeding	0 (0%)	168 (99%)	<0.001
Less nasal trauma	0 (0%)	162 (96%)	<0.001
More comfortable for the infant	1 (1%)	165 (98%)	<0.001
Parental preference	0 (0%)	162 (96%)	<0.001

*Not all practitioners responded to every question